REMARKS

Claims 6, 12, 36, 46, 69, 74, 78, 80 and 88 are amended. Claims 2-7, 9-13, 36-59 and 69-95 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Examiner Interview

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the time spent on the telephone discussing the disposition of this case. During the discussion, Applicant and the Examiner discussed the cited art and some claim modifications that would receive favorable treatment by the Examiner. While Applicant believes that such modifications are unnecessary, in the spirit of advancing prosecution of this matter, Applicant has made the clarifying amendments listed above and discussed below.

§103 Rejections

Claims 2, 5-7, 9-11, 36-40, 43, 46-48, 50-54, 59, 80, 81, 84-89 and 92-95 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,572,648 to Bibayan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,563,514 to Samar.

Claim 6, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a software application program comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- determining a user's context within an application program by ascertaining a position of a user's cursor within a document provided by the application program; and
- automatically displaying at least one command on a display for the user based on the user's context, wherein said automatically

displaying is accomplished, at least in part, using tree-based visibility expressions, wherein individual expressions define conditions associated with a user's interaction with the document and which are used to ascertain when to display said at least one command, and wherein individual expressions are represented in a tree data structure ***having one or more children nodes, said tree structure evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes***.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan and Samar teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, the Office equates Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar with "tree-based visibility expressions" as claimed. However, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan, which depicts a flowchart explaining *how* the dynamic tool palette display is modified, or Figs. 4-5 of Samar, which depict flowcharts for performing a simple lookup and retrieving information respectively, can possibly be equated with "tree-based visibility expressions" and individual expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that individual expressions are "represented in a tree data structure *having one or more children nodes, said tree structure evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes*." (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter. For instance, with respect to Fig. 5 of Bibayan in particular, even a cursory inspection of this figure shows that boxes S501 – S516

are a series of sequential steps in a method and therefore cannot be characterized as a tree structure "evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes."

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 2, 5-7 and 9-11 depend from claim 6 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 6, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 36, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a software application program comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- determining a user's context within an application program by evaluating at least portions of one or more expressions, each expression being associated with a context block and defining a condition that describes one or more aspects of a user's interaction with the application program, wherein individual expressions comprise tree-based visibility expressions, and wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are ***boolean expressions*** represented in a tree data structure; and
- automatically displaying, independent of a user selecting any displayed menu item, at least one context block on a display for the user based on the user's context, individual context blocks containing multiple commands that are possible selections for a user based upon their context.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan and Samar teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, the Office equates Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar with "tree-based visibility expressions" as claimed. However, Applicant fails to see

how Fig. 5 of Bibayan, which depicts a flowchart explaining *how* the dynamic tool palette display is modified, or Figs. 4-5 of Samar, which depict flowcharts for performing a simple lookup and retrieving information respectively, can possibly be equated with "tree-based visibility expressions" or individual tree-based visibility expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility expressions are *boolean expressions* represented in a tree data structure". (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter. For instance, with respect to Fig. 5 of Bibayan in particular, even a cursory inspection shows that this figure depicts a series of sequential steps in a method. As such, this figure cannot be characterized as a boolean expression "represented in a tree data structure".

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 36-40 and 43 depend from claim 36 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 36, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 46, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a software application program comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- determining a user's context within an application program without requiring the user to make a menu selection, wherein said determining is accomplished, at least in part, using tree-based

visibility expressions, wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions define conditions that describe a user's interactions with said application program, and wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are represented in a tree data structure ***having one or more children nodes, said tree structure evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes***;

- based on the user's context, displaying commands that are associated with the context and which can assist the user in accomplishing a task; and
- while the commands are being displayed, enabling the user to select and apply various commands multiple times.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan and Samar teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "tree-based visibility expressions" and individual tree-based visibility expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that individual tree-based visibility expressions are "represented in a tree data structure *having one or more children nodes, said tree structure evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes*." (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter.

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 47, 48, 50-54 and 59 depend from claim 46 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 46, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 80, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a software application program comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- determining a user's context within an application program by ascertaining a user's selection within a document provided by the application program and by using one or more tree-based visibility expressions, wherein individual expressions define conditions associated with a user's interaction with said document, and wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are represented in a tree data structure ***which evaluates to either true or false based upon the value of one or more children nodes in the tree data structure***; and
- automatically displaying at least one command on a display for the user based on the user's context.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan and Samar teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "tree-based visibility expressions" and individual tree-based visibility expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that individual tree-based visibility expressions are "*represented in a tree data structure which evaluates to either true*

or false based upon the value of one or more children nodes in the tree data structure". (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter.

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 81 and 84-87 depend from claim 80 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 80, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 88, as amended, recites a method of exposing commands in a software application program comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- determining a user's context within an application program using, at least in part, one or more tree-based visibility expressions, wherein individual expressions define conditions associated with a user's interaction with the application program, and wherein individual expressions are represented in a tree data structure ***having one or more children nodes, said tree structure evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes***; and
- automatically displaying at least one command on a display for the user based on the user's context, independent of a user selecting any displayed menu item.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan and Samar teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "tree-based visibility expressions" and

individual expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that individual tree-based visibility expressions are "represented in a tree data structure *having one or more children nodes, said tree structure evaluating to either true or false based at least in part upon the values of said one or more children nodes".* (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs 4-5 of Samar , teach or suggest any such subject matter.

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 89 and 92-95 depend from claim 88 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 88, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claims 3-4, 12-13, 41-42, 45, 49, 56-57, 82-83 and 90-91 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,504 to Meyer et al. (hereinafter "Meyer").

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 6. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 6. Furthermore, Meyer fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or

suggest all of the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

Claim 12, as amended, recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language in bold italics]:

- determine a user's context within an application program;
- automatically display, independent of the user selecting any displayed menu item, at least one command on a display for the user based on the user's context, said at least one command being displayed in a modeless fashion in which the user can continue to work within a document provided by the application program while said at least one command is displayed; and
- automatically remove said at least one command from the user's display responsive to a change in the user's context,
- wherein said automatically display and automatically remove are accomplished, at least in part, using tree-based visibility expressions, wherein individual expressions define conditions associated with a user's interaction with the application and are used to ascertain when to display said at least one command, and wherein individual expressions are represented in a tree data structure ***which evaluates to either true or false based upon the value of one or more children nodes in the tree data structure***.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "tree-based visibility expressions" and "wherein individual expressions are represented in a tree data structure, as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that individual expressions "are represented in a tree data structure *which evaluates to either true or false based upon the value of one or more children nodes in the tree data structure.*" (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter.

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claims 41-42 and 45 depend from claim 36. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 36. Furthermore, Meyer fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

Claims 49, 56-57 depend from claim 46. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 46. Furthermore, Meyer fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

Claims 82 and 83 depend from claim 80. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 80. Furthermore, Meyer fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

Claims 90 and 91 depend from claim 88. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 88. Furthermore, Meyer fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

Claim 58 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,602,996 to Powers et al. (hereinafter "Powers").

Claim 58 depends from claim 46. In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Powers teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 46. Furthermore, Powers fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of dependant claim 58, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claims 69-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,611,840 to Baer et al. (hereinafter "Baer") in view of Meyer and in further view of Bibayan and still further in view of Samar.

Claim 69, as amended, recites a computing system comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- a single application program configured to provide:
- a single navigable window;
- multiple different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated by a user; and
- at least one context-sensitive command area that is associated with the single navigable window, the single application program being configured to automatically change command sets that are presented to the user within the command area as the user navigates to different functionalities, at least some commands of the command sets being displayable independent of the user selecting any

displayed menu item and as a function of one or more tree-based visibility expressions that define conditions that describe a user's interactions with the single application program, wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are ***boolean expressions*** represented in a tree data structure.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Baer, Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "one or more tree-based visibility expressions" and individual tree-based visibility expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility expressions are *boolean expressions* represented in a tree data structure. (emphasis added). None of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter. For instance, with respect to Fig. 5 of Bibayan in particular, even a cursory inspection shows that this figure depicts a series of sequential steps in a method. As such, this figure cannot be characterized as a boolean expression "represented in a tree data structure".

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 70-73 depend from claim 69 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited

features which, in combination with those recited in claim 69, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 74, as amended, recites a computing system comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- a single application program embodied on a computer-readable medium, the single application being configured to:
- display a single navigable window for a user to use in navigating between multiple different functionalities that can be provided by the single application program;
- provide at least one context-sensitive command area that is associated with the single navigable window, the single application program automatically changing command sets that are presented to the user within the command area as the user navigates to different functionalities, at least some commands of the command sets being displayable independent of the user selecting any displayed menu item and as a function of one or more tree-based visibility expressions that define conditions that describe a user's interactions with the single application program, wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are ***boolean expressions*** represented in a tree data structure; and
- incorporate different functionalities in an extensible manner so that the user can use the single navigable window to navigate to the different incorporated functionalities.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Baer, Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "one or more tree-based visibility expressions" and individual tree-based visibility expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility expressions are *boolean expressions* represented in a tree data structure". (emphasis added). As noted above, none of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter.

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 75-77 depend from claim 74 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 74, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 78, as amended, recites a computing method comprising [added language in bold italics]:

- displaying a user interface that comprises a single navigable window that can be navigated between multiple different functionalities that are provided by a single application program;
- receiving user input that indicates selection of a particular functionality;
- responsive to receiving said user input, navigating the single navigable window to the particular selected functionality and displaying in said window indicia of said functionality that can enable a user to accomplish a task associated with the particular selected functionality;
- determining a user's context within the selected functionality using one or more tree-based visibility expressions, wherein individual ***tree-based*** expressions define conditions associated with a user's interaction with said selected functionality, and wherein individual tree-based visibility expressions are ***boolean expressions*** represented in a tree data structure; and
- automatically displaying at least one command for the user based on the user's context independent of the user selecting any displayed menu item.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Baer, Bibayan, Samar and Meyer teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For instance, as noted above, Applicant fails to see how Fig. 5 of Bibayan or Figs. 4-5 of Samar can possibly be equated with "one or more tree-based visibility expressions" and individual tree-based visibility expressions that are "represented in a tree data structure", as those terms are used and understood in the context of the subject application.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that "individual tree-based visibility expressions are *boolean expressions* represented in a tree data structure". (emphasis added). As noted above, none of the references cited by the Office, including Fig. 5 of Bibayan and Figs. 4-5 of Samar, teach or suggest any such subject matter.

Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claim 79 depends from claim 78 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 78, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar and in further view of Baer.

Claim 44 depends from claim 36. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Baer teach or suggest all of the

subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 36. Furthermore, Baer fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of dependant claim 44, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claim 55 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Bibayan in view of Samar and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,637 to Gayraud et al. (hereinafter "Gayraud").

Claim 55 depends from claim 46. In making out the rejection of these claims, the Office argues that Bibayan, Samar and Gayraud teach or suggest all of the subject matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, neither Bibayan nor Samar teach or suggest all the subject matter of claim 46. Furthermore, Gayraud fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, these references cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of dependant claim 55, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call from the Examiner.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3/7/2007

By: _____

Rich Bucher
Reg. No. 57,971
(509) 324-9256